

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 TO HA QUAN,
8 Plaintiff,
9 v.
10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
11 Defendant.
12

Case No. 01-cv-00435-PJH

ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 39

13
14 Before the court is the government's application for renewal of judgment lien.
15 Plaintiff opposes the application on the basis that there exists no abstract of judgment
16 and thus no judgment lien to renew. Dkt. 41. To the contrary, the government provides a
17 copy of the existing, recorded abstract of judgment in support of its reply brief. Dkt. 44-1.
18 The abstract of judgment reflects that judgment was entered on October 16, 2002, and
19 that the abstract was issued on February 13, 2003. The issuance of the abstract on that
20 date is reflected on the court's internal docket as well. Dkt. 36.

21 The existence of an abstract of judgment appears dispositive to this application,
22 and it appears that Quan's counsel did not possess a copy of the abstract of judgment at
23 the time the opposition brief was filed. Therefore, plaintiff may file a response to the
24 government's reply. The response may not exceed four (4) pages, and it must be filed
25 within one week from the date of this order.

26 //
27 //
28 //

1 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**
2

Dated: September 16, 2022

3 */s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton*
4

PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
United States District Court
Northern District of California